Remarks

        In response to the Office Action dated April 05, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 10, 27-28, 32-33, 37 and 41 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least on page 22, l. 10-15 in regards to terminating the feed and page 20, l. 1-7 and page 21, l. 18-21 in regards to handling all call records.

    102 Rejections

        Claims 10-16, 27-39, and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nolting (US Pat 7,027,574). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent they apply to the currently pending claims.

    Claims 10-16 and 41

        Amended independent claims 10 and 41 include similar recitations regarding communicating all inter-switch and intra-switch call records from a switch master to a computing system directly via a communication link. As a representative example, claim 10 recites "[a] method for communicating **all** telecommunication inter-switch and **intra-switch** call records … comprising receiving all inter-switch **and intra-switch** telecommunication call records from a plurality of remote telecommunication devices at a plurality of switches in communication with a switch master directly through a first communication link…." These recitations are supported by FIG. 4 and the related description. Nolting fails to disclose these recitations.

        On page 11, the Office Action clearly equates the recited switch master to the SS7 CDR server (item 220, Fig. 7) described in Nolting. However, Nolting expressly discloses that the SS7 CDR server 220 **only** receives CDR's from the site processors (212, 214, 216) which assemble information related **only to inter-switch** calls but do not handle intra-switch calls (col. 12, lines 1-25). Therefore, Nolting expressly describes that the SS7 CDR server 220 does not receive all inter-switch **and intra-switch** telecommunication call records. Thus, because the site processors (212, 214, 216) do not handle intra-switch calls, it is impossible for the SS7 CDR server 220 to handle all inter-switch and intra-switch call records. As such, the site processors

9

cannot be equated to the communication link between the switches and the SS7 CDR server 220 can not be equated to the switch master as recited in the claims.

In Nolting, the Automated Message Accounting (AMA) data is handled by AMA equipment in order to account for the inadequacies of the site processor/SS7 CDRF server so that all calls may be monitored, col. 12, lines 25-28. However, the AMA system requires a separate AMA network 222 leading to a message processing server (MPS) 224 which then feeds data to an AMA server 226, as shown in FIG. 7.

There is nothing disclosed in Nolting regarding a switch master that receives all call records via a direct communication link to the switch(es) handling the calls. As shown in FIG. 7, there is a separate AMA network 222 filled with AMA equipment that records AMA information about calls being handled by switches and then sends this AMA data to the MPS 224. For purposes of this argument only and without conceding to the presence of a switch master in Nolting, if one equates the MPS 224 to a switch master as claimed, there fails to be a direct communication of call records between the switch handling the call and the MPS 224. Instead, there is AMA equipment of the AMA network 222 that collects the AMA data and sends it to the MPS 224. Thus, the disclosure of Nolting fails to account for all of the recitations of the claims. Nolting therefore fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Nolting by the Office Action and amended independent claims 10 and 41 are allowable over Nolting for at least these reasons.

Claims 27-31

Independent claim 27 recites, in pertinent part :

"[a] computer implemented method for managing all call records received over a period of time associated with a telecommunication system in real time…comprising:
receiving all digits received over a period of time from a plurality of remote telecommunication devices at a plurality of corresponding switches in communication with a switch master directly through a first communication link substantially instantaneously after termination of at least one telecommunications transactions;
transmitting all the dial digits received over a period of time from the plurality of switches to the switch master in real time relative to the termination of the telecommunications transactions, wherein the switch master is in communication with at least a billing system directly through a second communication link and a computer system directly through a third communication link;
receiving all of the telecommunication call records from the switch master in real time relative to the termination of the telecommunications transactions into the computing system…"

10

Applicant respectfully notes that Nolting fails to disclose these recitations. On page 11, the Office Action explicitly equates the recited switch master to the SS7 CDR server (item 220, Fig. 7) described in Nolting.

However, Nolting expressly describes that the SS7 CDR server 220 **only** receives call records from the site processors (212, 214, 216) which assemble information related **only to inter-switch** calls but do not handle intra-switch calls (col. 12, lines 1-25). Therefore, Nolting expressly describes that the SS7 CDR server 220 does not describe receiving **all** digits received over a period of time from a plurality of remote telecommunication devices at a plurality of corresponding switches in communication with a switch master directly through a first communication link substantially instantaneously after termination of at least one telecommunications transactions nor does it describe transmitting **all** the dial digits received over a period of time from the plurality of switches to the switch master in real time relative to the termination of the telecommunications transactions, wherein the switch master is in communication with at least a billing system directly through a second communication link and a computer system directly through a third communication link.

Nolting can not describe receiving **all** digits received over a period of time from a plurality of remote telecommunication devices at a plurality of corresponding switches in communication with a switch master because the site processors (212, 214, 216) do not handle intra-switch calls and it therefore is impossible for the SS7 CDR server 220 to handle all inter-switch and intra-switch call records. As such, the site processors cannot be equated to the communication link between the switches and the SS7 CDR server 220 can not be equated to the switch master as recited in the claims.

As discussed above in regards to amended independent claims 10 and 41, the Automated Message Accounting (AMA) data is handled in Nolting by AMA equipment in order to account for the inadequacies of the site processor/SS7 CDR server so that all calls may be monitored, col. 12, lines 25-28. However, the AMA system requires a separate AMA network 222 leading to a message processing server (MPS) 224 which then feeds data to an AMA server 226, as shown in FIG. 7. As such, the disclosure of Nolting fails to account for all of the recitations of the claims. Nolting therefore fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Nolting by the Office Action and claims 10-16 and 41 are allowable over Nolting for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, claim 27 additionally recites "transmitting all the dial digits received over a period of time from the plurality of switches to the switch master in real time relative to the termination of the telecommunications transactions, wherein the switch master is in communication with at least a billing system directly through a second communication link and a computer system directly through a third communication link…." These recitations are also supported by FIG. 4 and the related description.

Nolting fails to disclose a billing system and that the switch master is in communication with the billing system directly through a second communication link and a computer system directly through a third communication link. Thus, Nolting fails to disclose all of these recitations of claim 27 such that claim 27 is allowable over Nolting for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 33-39

Amended independent claims 33 and 37 include recitations to a switch master that executes a script upon receiving a command from the user. As a representative example, claim 37 recites "the switch master maintaining a script in memory to discontinue a data feed and cause received call records to be forwarded by the switch master, the switch master control means providing a log in for remotely accessing the switch master control means from the computing system means, wherein the switch master control means receives a user command to execute the script …." These recitations are supported in relation to FIGs. 4 and 5 and the related description, particularly at page 39. Nolting fails to disclose these recitations.

There is no disclosure of a switch master in Nolting, particularly one that maintains a script in memory where the script causes incoming call records to be forwarded and that provides a log in for remote access to the switch master. Further, there is also no disclosure in Nolting regarding receiving a user command to execute the script that causes the incoming call records to be forwarded.

The Office Action apparently cites Col. 5, l.11-13 and Col. 12, l. 52-60 of Nolting as describing that the switch master (equated by the Office Action to SS7 CDR server 220) maintains a script in memory to discontinue a data feed and cause received call records to be forwarded by the switch master. Applicant respectfully points out that the Examiner's citation is

referring to a traffic monitoring computer program (Col. 5, l. 11-13; Col. 11, l. 19-22; Col. 12, l. 52-60 and Col. 13, l. 1-23). Nolting does not describe that the traffic analysis program is resident on the SS7 CDR server 220 nor that it discontinues a data feed and causes received call records to be forwarded by the switch master. Nolting describes that the traffic analysis program is resident on a separate OLAP Server (Fig. 7, 230).

Additionally, a script is not a computer program, according to exemplary embodiments. A script allows changes without having to re-compile a whole computer program. With a conventional computer program you have to go back to its source, make changes, recompile, and then execute the whole program all over again. Nolting does not describe maintaining a script in memory to discontinue a data feed and cause received call records to be forwarded by the switch master. Accordingly, Nolting fails to disclose all of the recitations of claims 37-39 such that claims 37-39 are allowable over Nolting.

As to amended independent claim 33, amended independent claim 33 contains similar recitations as amended independent claim 37 and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, amended independent claim 33 also recites in pertinent part:

"[a] system for managing all inter-switch and intra-switch telecommunication call records, comprising:
a plurality of telecommunication switches that receive a plurality of inter-switch and intra-switch telecommunication call records;
a switch master in communication with at least a billing system via a data feed, a computer system and the plurality of telecommunication switches in real time and that receives all of the plurality of inter-switch and intra-switch telecommunication call records from the plurality of telecommunication switches…"

As described in regards to amended independent claims 10 and 41, amended claim 33 also recites switches and a switch master receiving **all** inter-switch and intra-switch telecommunication call records where Nolting describes that receiving intra-switch telecommunication call records by the SS7 CDR Server (220) or the switches (212, 214, 216) is not possible, thereby requiring the use of a parallel AMA system. As such, amended independent claim 33 is allowable over Nolting for at least this additional reason.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 10-16, 27-39, and 41 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and

remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 3, 2007

  /Arno T. Naeckel/

Arno T. Naeckel
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(770) 518-9822